

PATENT

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office action dated 3/16/2004 is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.111(b).

On 5/14/03 a status request, a revocation and new power of attorney, and 5 sheets of formal drawings were sent to the PTO.

The Examiner has not indicated whether the drawings were received.

Previously attempted revocations of power of attorney and new power of attorney apparently have not been entered as the office action was sent to the prior correspondence address. Applicant again includes a revocation and new power of attorney for this case including a statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) and a copy of the authorization for Ms. McBain to act on behalf of Xerox Corporation. Please stop sending communications to Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly in Palo Alto CA. If there exists some reason why the revocation and new power cannot be entered, please contact me, Daniel B. Curtis at (650) 812-4259.

Claims 2-4, 9-11, 16-18, and 23-24 were canceled.

Claims 1, 8, 14, 15, 22, 26 and 27 were amended.

Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 27 were amended by adding a limitation from a canceled claim that the network device be a printer, copier, scanner or facsimile machine and that operation of the network device be permitted by a usage policy associated with the network user, and specifying these policies. The specified policies are described in the instant application on page 11, line 23 through page 13, line 20.

I. Rejections under 35 USC §101

Claim 8 was rejected as "a 'code segment' not claimed as embodied in computer readable-media is descriptive material...and is not statutory". Claims 8 and 14 were

PATENT

amended to claim the code segments as being embodied on the computer readable medium. Thus, these claims are not statutory.

II. Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Original claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll (6,105,131) in view of Debry (6,314,521). This rejection of the currently amended claims is respectfully traversed in view of the following arguments.

A prima facie case of obviousness is established by one or more references that were available to the inventor and that teach a suggestion to combine or modify the reference, the combination or modification of which would appear to be sufficient to have made the claimed invention obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to claims 1, 8, 11, 22 and 27: These claims have been amended to include the limitation that the network device is a printer, copier scanner or facsimile machine and that the operation of the network device be permitted by specific usage policies associated with the network user.

Carroll teaches a secure server system that uses digital certificates. However Carroll does not teach a suggestion to use a digital certificates with a printer, a copier, a scanner, or a facsimile machine. Further, Carroll does not teach a suggestion to use the claimed policies with these devices.

Debry teaches a printer device that uses digital certificates.

The office action asserts that Debry's teaching of "encrypting and decrypting the message request containing it's serial number (see abstract)..." teaches a policy.

The currently amended claims 1, 8, 11, 22 and 27 include the limitation:

wherein ...; and the policy is at least one of a policy to access special paper stock, a policy to allow the network device to decrypt and print a document only if the network user was physically near the network device, a policy to print a selected watermark when printing the document, a policy to enable the network device to accept digital cash

PATENT

associated with an operation on the document, a policy to enable a billing function, a routing policy, and a policy to escrow a document.

These policies are disclosed in the instant application on page 11, line 23 through page 13, line 20. Nothing in Debry teaches a suggestion for these policies:

- a policy to access special paper stock,
- a policy to allow the network device to decrypt and print a document only if the network user was physically near the network device,
- a policy to print a selected watermark when printing the document,
- a policy to enable the network device to accept digital cash associated with an operation on the document,
- a policy to enable a billing function,
- a routing policy,
- and a policy to escrow a document.

Nothing in the combination of Carroll and Debry teaches a suggestion that would lead one skilled in the art to implement these policies in a method, a computer program, or a system. Thus, currently amended claims 1, 8, 11, 22 and 27 are patentable.

Claims 5-7 depend on and further limit currently amended claim 1 that is patentable. Thus, claims 5-7 are patentable.

Claims 12-14 depend on and further limit currently amended claim 8 that is patentable. Thus, claims 12-14 are patentable.

Claims 19-21 depend on and further limit currently amended claim 15 that is patentable, thus, claims 19-21 are patentable.

Claims 25-26 depend on and further limit currently amended claim 22 that is patentable, thus, claims 25-26 are patentable.


PATENT

Since all rejections, objections and requirements contained in the outstanding official action have been fully answered or traversed and shown to be inapplicable to the present claims, it is respectfully submitted that reconsideration is now in order under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.111(b) and such reconsideration is respectfully requested. Upon reconsideration, it is also respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is therefore respectfully requested.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned attorney authorized by Xerox Corporation hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Should any additional issues remain, or if I can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 812-4259.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel B. Curtis
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 39,159
(650) 812-4259
dbcurtis@parc.com